

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The rejections presented in the Office Action dated April 8, 2008, (hereinafter Office Action) have been considered, and reconsideration of the pending claims and allowance of the application in view of the present response is respectfully requested.

With respect to the objection to the Specification, the Specification has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. In view of these changes, the objection is believed to be overcome, and Applicant requests that the objection be removed.

In an effort to facilitate prosecution and without acquiescing to characterizations of the asserted art, Applicant's claimed subject matter, or to the applications of the asserted art or combinations thereof to Applicant's claimed subject matter, independent Claims 1, 13, 25, and 26 have been amended to include the limitations of original dependent Claims 3 and 15. Since these limitations were present in the original claims, the changes do not introduce new matter. In view of these changes, each of the pending claims is believed to be patentable over the asserted references for the reasons set forth below.

Each of the rejections (§§ 102(b) and 103(a)) relies upon the teachings of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0171857 Hisatomi *et al.* (hereinafter "Hisatomi") which does not teach at least including in a definition file, information on decomposition of document data into one or more compressed image files, as now claimed in each of the independent claims. In contrast, the cited portion of Hisatomi merely teaches conversion of image data to bitmap data, which is otherwise known as rasterization (*see, e.g.*, the cited U.S. Patent No. 6,538,766 to Henry *et al.* at column 5, lines 39-48 and the article at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Raster_image_processor). The general discussion of converting to raster data in the printer of Hisatomi fails to correspond to the claimed inclusion by a data processing device, with a definition file, of information on decomposition of document data into one or more compressed image files. Without correspondence to each of the claim limitations, at least the § 102(b) rejection would be improper.

In order to anticipate a claim, the asserted reference must teach every element of the claim. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is

found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the patent claim; *i.e.* every element of the claimed invention must be literally present, arranged as in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Therefore, all claim elements, and their limitations, must be found in the prior art reference to maintain the rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicant respectfully submits that Hisatomi does not teach every element of amended independent Claims 1, 13, 25, and 26 in the requisite detail and therefore fails to anticipate Claims 1, 2, 11-14, 18, and 23-26. Applicant accordingly requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2, 11, 12, 14, 18, 23, and 24 depend from independent Claims 1 and 13, respectively, and also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Hisatomi. While Applicant does not acquiesce with the particular rejections to these dependent claims, these rejections are also improper for the reasons discussed above in connection with the independent claims. These dependent claims include all of the limitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claims and recite additional features which further distinguish these claims from the cited reference. Therefore, the rejection of dependent Claims 2, 11, 12, 14, 18, 23, and 24 is improper, and Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

With respect to the § 103(a) rejections, the additionally relied upon references do not teach the limitations absent in Hisatomi. For example, none of the other relied-upon teachings have been asserted as teaching, or shown to teach, including in a definition file, information on decomposition of document data into one or more compressed image files, as claimed. Without correspondence to each of the claim limitations, the § 103(a) rejections would be improper and the rejections should not be maintained.

It should be noted that Applicant does not acquiesce to the Examiner’s statements or conclusions concerning what would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, obvious design choices, common knowledge at the time of Applicant’s invention, officially noticed facts, and the like. Applicant reserves the right to address in detail the Examiner’s characterizations, conclusions, and rejections in future prosecution.

Authorization is given to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3581 (KOLS.107PA) any necessary fees for this filing. If the Examiner believes it necessary or helpful, the undersigned attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss any issues related to this case.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLINGSWORTH & FUNK, LLC
8009 34th Avenue South, Suite 125
Minneapolis, MN 55425
952.854.2700

Date: July 7, 2008

By: Erin M. Nichols

Erin M. Nichols
Reg. No. 57,125